



## Multicultural Governance and Cultural Diversity Challenge

Benfodda Assia\*

Belhaj Bouchaib University of Ain Temouchent (Algeria),  
e-mail : assia.benefdda@gmail.com

Submitted  
06-09-2021

Accepted  
30-10-2021

Published  
01-12-2021

### Abstract:

“Pluralism” is not a new phenomenon, but the new issue about it is the growth and expansion of “diversity” in the world. “Pluralism” is a social fact representing different beliefs, attitudes and ways of life. The pluralist world, then, tries to encourage the presence of many diverse and incompatible theoretical and moral standards, belief systems and key values to manage conflict and bigotry that come out of differences. As a result, multiculturalism arose as a reference to a wide variety of theories, attitudes, beliefs, norms, practices and policies in search of public recognition and support for non-dominant cultural groups. Nevertheless, a multicultural approach is different from social and cultural diversity as it goes beyond the elementary civil and political liberties related to conformist liberal citizenship.

**Keywords:** *Cultural Diversity; Multiculturalism; Identity; Globalisation; Multicultural Governance.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Culture and society are inseparable so that there is no society without culture and no culture without society. There fore, the existence of varied cultures in one society brings diversity in human life. “Cultural pluralism”, “cultural diversity” and “multiculturalism” are the most common terms used to define societies of various cultures, religions, languages and races. Yet, “plurality” includes the coexistence of many cultures with no consideration of the way they relate to each other while diversity refers to multiplicity of distinct entities which are different from one another. Likewise, the concept of “multiculturalism” approves the idea of difference and heterogeneity that is embodied in the concept of “diversity”.

On the other side, multiculturalism becomes the foremost issue of modern social and political theories, particularly in contemporary social sciences. It also

---

\* Corresponding author



occupies a dominant place in public culture of western liberal democracies and in global political discourse. Currently, multicultural debates emphasise the nature of global justice and the search for universal standards of human rights. According to Song (2010), multiculturalism is much related to “identity politics,” “the politics of difference” and “the politics of recognition”, all of which have in common a devotion to re-evaluating discriminated identities and enhancing their representation in public sphere.

In admitting the shift from highlighting cultural diversity to emphasising multicultural policies, this current study investigates the challenges that diversity may pose for multicultural governance. It aims to provide answers to the following questions:

- What are the main differences between diversity and multiculturalism?
- To what extent is multicultural governance successful in dealing with diversity?

The hypotheses formulated are as follows:

- Diversity refers to a variety of communities which are different from one another, whereas multiculturalism promotes difference and heterogeneity that is embodied in the concept of “diversity”.
- Multicultural governance may strengthen the recognition and the preservation of diversity and the right of ethnic minorities to be different and treated equally.

The work is divided into two parts; the first part explores the main approaches of diversity and multiculturalism, and the second part examines their implementation through multicultural governance policies.

## **2. Diversity and Difference**

The two concepts are not identical; if diversity is about categorisation, then difference is about contextualisation. Whereas diversity represents an experiential statement about its existence in society, difference applies its politicisation within the context of unequal power relations. If diversity describes variety, then difference capitalises on this empirical reality to challenge, resist, and change. If diversity tends toward the de-contextualised, difference consists of layered relationships of power and disparity, reflecting the placement of individuals by those with the power to identify, name, and categorise differences into flexible groupings that are both debated and growing (Dei, 2000 cited in Fleras, 2008).

On the other side, the concepts of diversity and difference are interchangeably used at the governance level where references to diversity represent an executive interpretation of differences that need to be synchronised,

controlled, and depoliticised (Ang and Saint Louis, 2005). Therein the logic behind official multiculturalism depends on taking the difference out of diversity, in that lies the source of confusion and disagreement, especially when the politics of difference is demoted to the level of diversity for policy reasons.

The pluralist crisis is clear then; too much of cultural differences privileges recognition at the expense of equality (Yates, 2001 cited in Hollinger, 2008). Too little attention to difference can have a degrading effect on those whose differences are disadvantaged. As a result, a major governance breach is exposed; those who believe in the primary resemblance of humanity versus those who believe in its vital differences. If people are basically alike, then paying attention to differences is rather insignificant in defining who gets what. If people are essentially different, then governance must take differences seriously as basis for recognition and reward.

To sum up, each of these difference discourses can be alternatives for living together differently: an abstracted pluralism support differences in principle rather than in practice; and a radical pluralism approves the dominance of difference apart from society interests. The role of governance is to adjust as many varied interests and demands as possible by institutionalising exceptions as the rule i.e. plural multicultural model. A conservative multicultural model is to establish a common structure that applies to all members of society regardless of who they are (Hansen, 2007). A third governance prototype is a liberal multicultural model that recognises the importance of treating everyone equally; it also acknowledges the prominence of difference to define who gets what when the situation arises.

### 2.1 From Diversity to Multiculturalism

The presence of different cultures in society brings diversity in human life. “Cultural pluralism”, “cultural diversity” (Parekh, 2000) and “multiculturalism” (Mahajan, 1999) are the most common terms used to describe societies of multiple cultures, religions, languages and races. However, “plurality” suggests the existence of many cultures with no consideration of the way they relate to each other whereas diversity refers to multiplicity of separate entities which are different from one another. Furthermore, the concept of “multiculturalism” supports the idea of difference and heterogeneity that is represented in the concept of “diversity”. In modern societies the state is usually recognised as majority culture where the cultures that are different from this majority are mainly considered as minorities.

Moreover “pluralism” is not a new phenomenon, but the new issue about it is the development and spread of “diversity” in the world of ideas. “Pluralism” is a social fact that is represented in different beliefs, attitudes and ways of life. The

pluralist world then would tolerate the existence of many varied and incompatible conceptual and moral ideals, many belief systems and decisive values to deal with conflict and intolerance that come out of differences. The last four decades of the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of a bunch of intellectual and political movements led by various groups as the indigenous people, national minorities, old and new immigrants, feminist movements, etc. They represent morals, ideologies and ways of life that are different from the dominant culture of the wider society. Their demands go far beyond the call for toleration. They want the wider society to treat them equally with the rest and to respect their differences so as to enable them to realise their identities in all aspects of life.

As a consequence of these different movements, multiculturalism emerged as a reference to a broad range of theories, attitudes, beliefs, norms, practices and policies that seek to provide public recognition and support for non-dominant cultural groups. However multicultural approach is different from social and cultural diversity as it goes beyond the basic civil and political liberties associated with liberal citizenship to bring a differentiated citizenship that allows groups to express their identities and practices (Iverson, 2011). According to Mahajan (2010), theorists of multiculturalism protest against any systematic discrimination, give positive value to cultural diversity. Multiculturalism then becomes a way to respond to cultural diversity as it endorses the importance of equal treatment of different communities in public sphere.

Furthermore, multiculturalism has become the main topic of modern social and political theory in particular and in contemporary social sciences in general. It has also occupied a central place in public culture of western liberal democracies and in global political discourse. Now the multicultural ideas have spread to debate over the nature of global justice and the search for global norms of human rights. For Song (2010), multiculturalism is much associated with “identity politics,” “the politics of difference” and “the politics of recognition”, all of which share a devotion to reconsidering discriminated identities and changing dominant patterns of representation and communication that marginalise certain groups.

Though the traditional model of citizenship as common-rights is deeply connected to ideas of national integration, many groups like blacks, women, indigenous peoples, ethnic and religious minorities, feel segregated not because of their socio-economic status but because of their socio-cultural identity. They point out that the common rights citizenship disregards the needs of other groups. However the standards governing their claims cannot be derived from one culture alone but through an equal dialogue between different cultures based on the principle of justice and toleration. Consequently, multiculturalism approaches try

to emphasise the need to have a stable identity and accentuate the importance of cultural belonging. It identifies the difference through institutional and policy reforms that take into account the claims of marginalised group.

According to Modood (2007) when we speak of difference rather than culture from the sociological standpoint is to recognise the difference not only from the inside (i.e. from the side of the minority culture) but also from the outside (i.e. outside treatment towards these minorities in question). It also admits the nature of the minorities and their relationship with the rest of the societies. Multiculturalism is not, therefore only about cultural rights instead of political equality and economic opportunities. It is also the politics which sees the post-immigrant groups and creates awareness that these group differentiating cultural aspects are essential to their social construction.

### 2.2 Multiculturalism, Diversity and Identity

There are four identity theories typically employed by contemporary social studies: personal identity, role identity, social identity, and collective identity. Personal identity is the most elementary of the four identities. It is what makes every person unique, defining them through their specific biographies (e.g., name, birthplace), unique characteristics (e.g., intelligent, athletic), role identities (e.g., daughter, employee), and particular combination of private and public experiences. Role identity is defined as the role (or character) people play when holding specific social positions in groups. It is relational, since people interact with each other via their own role identities. (Bedjaoui, 2015)

Social identity emphasises how a person's cognition, affect, and personality traits affect immediate person-to-person social interactions and vice versa. It is the part of an individual's self-concept formed through the knowledge of his or her membership in meaningful social groups, organisations and categories. Collective identities are especially important to social movement participants, political activists, and others banding together to fight for or against social change by working on shared goals and action plans. (Bedjaoui, 2015) In short, it is a process by which a set of individuals interacts to create a shared sense of identity or group consciousness.

Multiculturalism now is very different from its early form and its effect on personal and collective identity, the governance practices and negotiation of tensions is deep. It becomes clear that most people are now exposed to diversity in all aspects of their daily lives; in their local communities, schools and workplaces, or obliquely via television, social networks and other media. The more diverse societies are and the more people are exposed to difference, the more they seem, however, to retreat into their own identity, adopt identity politics and approve

nationalist ideologies. This could be, partly, because of the lack of real engagement with difference.

Robert Putnam (2000) demonstrated that social capital is contrariwise related to diversity because “immigration and ethnic diversity challenge social solidarity and constrain social capital”. (Putnam 2007, p137) However, he suggested that in the medium to longer term, “successful immigrant societies create new forms of social solidarity and dampen the negative effects of diversity by constructing new, more encompassing identities. Thus, the central challenge for modern, diversifying societies is to create a new, broader sense of ‘we’”(ibid.) Indeed, this is the challenge, yet, there is still lack of “clear” vision and established policy and practice to make the larger sense of “we” into a reality.

Likewise, the world seems more disposed to ethnic and religious conflict with over 70 per cent of wars having an ethnic or religious dimension (Baldwin et al., 2007). Actually, there are signs of a mounting number of divisions and more fanatic separatist movements, where people no longer feel capable of even sharing the same land or government; many nations were created in recent years as a result of the collapse of formerly constructed federations in the Balkans and Eastern Europe, or divisions were turned into separation, for example in the lately divided Sudan. More separations are possibly on the cards with states like Belgium becoming almost ungovernable as a one entity and with secessionist movements, mainly in Scotland and Catalonia.

On the one hand, Sen (2006) argued that conflict and violence are constant today, no less than the past, by the delusion of a unique identity. He approves that the world is progressively separated between religions, cultures and civilisations, which disregard the importance of other ways in which people see themselves through class, gender, profession, language, literature, science, music, ethics or politics. Many thinkers, such as Younge (2010), believe that the promotion of identity is caused by the decline of democracy, and that globalisation weakens the democracy and sovereignty of the nation state and transforms individuals into a “universal tribe of consumers” who are “economically interdependent but isolated and impotent as citizens.” (Cantle, 2012, p17)Younge’s argument is persuasive, particularly in the context of the making of the Euro and the globalisation of products which weaken local businesses. He concludes that the greater the loss of control and access to democracy, the more people retreat into isolated identities or tribes.

In addition, the sense of shared identity changed deeply in all Western societies, but it is unavoidably understood in different ways by minority and majority groups. This is mirrored in the altering nature of personal identities in

## Multicultural Governance and Cultural Diversity Challenge

---

terms of faith, present locality, and ethnicity, as well as a seemingly decreasing sense of nationality. In the case of Britain, the 2011 Searchlight Educational Trust (SET) report revealed that despite the fact that many ethnic groups saw themselves in a similar way, Asian and Black groups differed meaningfully from White groups in some aspects; the three components of nationality, country of birth and residence were most significant for White groups (67 per cent) compared with Asian (46 per cent) and Black (21 per cent).

Minorities were also more likely to consider religion and ethnicity as the most central part of their identity. Moreover, the influence of diversity on personal identities is mainly intense, with individuals generally attached to their cultural heritage, belief, language, diaspora and new national identity so as to construct hybrid or multiple identities. As Brah (2007) indicated, identity is a process and not a static category. Hence, Identity is more and more complex along with hybridity of nationality, faith and ethnicity, as a consequence of cultural diversity shared within the same society which led to the evolution of “mixed race” or multiple identities.

In spite of this wide-ranging diversity and varying patterns of identity, governmental replies remained ambiguous. Mostly, they tried to strengthen their view of national identity through some procedures such as the teaching of national history and the promotion of national citizenship and identity. By consistently maintaining the integrity of national borders and governance, and trying to reject the interdependence carried by globalisation, they toughen a fear of “others”. They, then, stay behind the existing reality of multiple identities within their communities and may find that social media can form new transnational relationships which surpass traditional power structures. Besides, there is strong evidence of deterioration in traditional democracies across Europe, with election voters and political party membership in decline.

Besides, such policies support multiculturalism, which placed identity as stagnant and limited. Nevertheless, the reality for many people today is that identity is transitory and, at least partially, chosen. For Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah (2010), the spread of mixed race, intermarriage across national, faith and other borders is a reality for many people:

In an age of super diversity where people do not identify around single identities and feel conflicted allegiance (if any allegiance at all) to pre-defined groups, activism around particular ‘strands’ seems irrelevant to many people and may not even be that effective in addressing the true causes of inequality. Even the very categorisations that we rely on (for example, ‘black’, ‘gay’, ‘Asian’ or ‘disabled’) no longer seem to

be able to tell us much about who people, what lives they lead, who they identify with, or what services they need from government and society. And the tick box approach seems to be missing out on growing numbers of people who fall outside or across standard classifications. Yet society seems to treat ethnic identities as if they are clearly bounded, static and meaningful, and public bodies insist on a tick box classification. (Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah, 2010, p11)

Yet, past ideas of identity remain, maintained by systems of over-protective community leaders and single identity funding which have standardised and toughened in-group restrictions and stereotypes.

### **2.3 Multiculturalism, Diversity and Globalisation**

*Globalisation*, in sociology, is defined as an on-going process that involves interconnected changes in the economic, cultural, social, and political spheres of *society*. As a process, it involves the ever-increasing integration of these aspects between nations, regions, communities, and even seemingly isolated places. Globalisation also represents the intensification of economic, cultural, and political practices accelerating across the globe in the early 21st century. Most countries in the world are culturally diverse. According to world statistics, in 184 independent countries there are about 600 languages and 500 ethnic groups (Human Development Report, 2016). Only a small number of countries in the world can say that their citizens share the same language and belong to the same ethno-national group. However, this diversity may pose many important questions that can be subject to disagreement. Minorities and the majority are mainly opposed to various matters such as language rights, regional autonomy, political representation, educational programmes, national symbols, choice of anthem or national holidays.

Finding moral and political answers to these questions is the major challenge that most democracies are faced with today; the attempt to make liberal-democratic institutions in Eastern Europe and the Third World are weakened by patriotic conflicts. In Western Europe frequent disagreements concerning immigrants' rights and other cultural minorities challenge the expectations on which decades of political life is based on. Modern societies are mostly faced by minority groups in search of recognition of their own identity; this is usually seen as the chief challenge of multiculturalism. However, the latter often covers several forms of cultural pluralism, each of which represents a test of its own. In addition, minorities are merged with political communities in different ways, from conquest and colonisation of formerly independent societies to voluntary immigration of

## Multicultural Governance and Cultural Diversity Challenge

---

individuals and families. These differences influence the kind of relationship that they want to found with the broader society.

Thus, cultural diversity is shaped by integrating previously autonomous and territorially concerted cultures into a larger state. These incorporated cultures (national minorities) are likely to remain as isolated communities within a predominant culture requiring independence or self-government in order to provide their own survival as singular societies. In another case, cultural diversity may be formed by individual or family immigration. These immigrants frequently constitute moveable associations called ethnic groups. Generally, these groups are ready to mix with the wider society and be accepted as full members. Though they try to look for greater recognition of their own ethnic identities, their aim is not to become autonomous nationalities, but to adjust the institutions and laws to get used to cultural differences.

During the course of history, governments were the makers of different policies toward cultural minorities in order to achieve the ideal of a homogeneous state; some minorities were exterminated either by mass persecutions or by genocide. Others were assimilated by force, and were obliged to adopt the language, religion and traditions of the majority. Whereas others were treated as aliens and were exposed to physical segregation and economic discrimination through which all their rights were eradicated. Nevertheless, countless efforts to defend cultural minorities and to regulate possible conflicts between minorities and the majority were made, often via bilateral agreements. After the Second World War, it became clear that there was need for a different approach to minority rights. Many liberals expected the resolution of minority conflicts on the basis of "human rights" agreement. Instead of protecting themselves directly, cultural minorities were protected indirectly, by ensuring elementary civil and political rights such as freedom of speech and association, regardless of individuals' group affiliation.

Moreover, there was a general inclination for the advance of human rights to overcome the problem of national minorities through guaranteeing basic individual rights to all human beings. Yet, the main theory was that the members of national minorities did not need rights of a special character and should not acquire special powers. The policy of human rights was considered as a substitute for minority rights, with strong insistence on the fact that minorities could not legally seek guarantees to preserve their ethnic and group rights. So as to resolve these questions impartially, it was necessary to enhance the traditional doctrine of human rights theory of minority rights. The need for such a philosophy became clear in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union where clashes over local

autonomy, determination of borders and other ethnic matters caused fierce conflicts in a great part of the region. Thus, there was little prospect of founding a steady peace in these regions, or of respecting basic human rights, without resolving all minority problems. Currently, the view that it is legitimate to ask for additional items to the conventional policy of minority rights is more and more accepted. An inclusive theory of justice in multicultural countries should comprise universal rights which belong to individuals no matter their group.

### **3. Politics of Multiculturalism**

As a result of many factors including globalisation, immigration, decline of traditional moral consensus, consolidation of human rights agendas, and liberal emphasis on individual choice (Lavie, 2005), conformist governance models of assimilation, segregation, and separation are constantly disputed by diversity politics of difference that claims new policies of living together in practical and equitable ways. According to EDG (2007), the politics of governance is at the forefront of public debate over managing diversity and difference. Consequently, governments have begun to revisit their public policies and governance rules. Relations between minorities and majorities have shifted accordingly, with rearrangement varying between countries and evolving over time (Watt, 2006 cited in Kymlicka, 2007).

In addition, the management of diversity and difference under multicultural governance is increasing to the vanguard of global political programs. In the past, nation-states were ruled by a majority national group who adopted the state for self-serving purposes, in contrast to the present politics of governance that no longer tolerate mono-cultural agenda. Thus most democratic societies are confronted by diversity politics and the politics of difference, reflecting, in part, the interaction of demographics with minority political determination and a growing human rights agenda (Kymlicka, 2007). Ethnic variety rather than mono-cultural uniformity characterises the demographics of most societies, resulting in deep social gaps because of religious prejudice, economic and cultural differences, intergroup competition, and historical hatreds (Peleg, 2007).

However those programmes, skills, and vocabulary that developed to control the politics of culturally homogeneous states are of limited help or cause an unbearable obstacle in accommodating the legitimate demands of unity and diversity. According to Abbas (2005), “the notion of multiculturalism with its corresponding concept of accommodating those who do not share the dominant cultural ethos is not without consequences. Political and governance problems are created that have no parallel in history.”(Fleras, 2009, p24) Furthermore, a commitment to cultural homogeneity, which was crucial for national identity and

social integration, is now harshly contested. Recent social transformations and the politicisation of difference, cultural and religious minorities are challenging conformist notions of democratic governance (Koenig, 1999 cited in Shachar, 2007). Consequently, new governance alterations are growing that include minority rights and identity claims without revoking the values of social justice and national unity (Inglis, 1996).

Moreover, multiculturalism as governance no longer resonates with legitimacy and authority, although migrants and minorities continue to depend on its relevance and value in preserving their interests. This conflict of interest engenders a fundamental contradiction: To one side, increasingly politicised minorities demand a redistribution of power and privilege, so that full and equal inclusion in society does not compromise their identities in the public domain (Koenig and de Guchteneire, 2007). On the one side, central authorities try to reconcile these conflicting interests without compromising a commitment to national unity or minority difference, a framework is evolving for constructing a feasible community out of ethnically diverse populations. The challenge lies in balancing a liberal commitment to the individuality of autonomy, diversity, and equality with a society building agenda of a common language, shared culture, and national identity (Baubock, 2005). Despite the fact that diversity and difference are perceived as opposed to society building (Beissinger, 2008), multicultural governance remains a practical alternative. The challenge of accommodating different political claims of individuals and groups with the claims of the nation - state as a whole is exposed to require a composite governance act between two demands – social unity on the one hand and insertion of diversity and difference on the other hand (Reitz, 2009).

### 3.1 Politics of Multiculturalism and Diversity

In the community, school, media, and workplace, diversity is valued and practiced throughout the world. Ideologies endorsing diversity and difference are extensively adopted and expressed in official government policy and practice, in legislation and celebrations. Businesses regularly approve recruitment, promotion, and retention enterprises that are intended to guarantee a varied and complete labour force through exclusion of prejudiced obstacles. As Boli and Elliott (2008) indicate, academic journals look for assorted editorial boards, companies want varied boards of managers, broadcasters are casting about for miscellaneous teams, and organisations set up executive offices whose main responsibility is the search of rising inclusiveness.

Certainly, a diversity commitment is not without its blemishes. Such a commitment destroys integration and stability, creates conflict because of

incompatible values, legitimates human rights violations, reduces individuality to collective identities, deforms the principle of diversity, and reflects a focus on the superficial instead of more pressing issues related to power and inequality (Lentin and Titley, 2008). So far, a commitment to diversity is still appreciated and legitimised on moral basis; people have a right to be different yet the same. The first decade of the twenty-first century has made it clear that the management of diversity and difference can no longer be taken for granted or left to chance. The junction of globalisation and communication/transportation technologies has seen to that, as have global migration flows and emergent human rights agendas (Fleras, 2009).

Diversity politics and the politics of difference are now a widespread if debated trait of the modern political landscape (Frederickson, 1999). Besides, diversity is gradually politicised because of open competition for power, resources, and recognition. This is barely astonishing since nation-state building commonly inflicts a burden on migrants and minorities who reject their assimilation into a difference-uncompassionate system (Kymlicka and Opalski, 2001). Thus, countries facing multicultural politics are rethinking the governance plan with protective barriers. With all the reactions against multiculturalism as public discourse resolutely recognised, a neo-monoculture; common identities and citizenship that compose “nationhood”, is gradually abounding (Joppke, 2004). Furthermore, an open rejection of multiculturalism as governance, in exchange for integration models, without removing the pluralistic principles and practices that are deeply ingrained in society, continues at local and regional levels rather than nationally or officially. In addition, responses to politics of difference vary: (a) from difference as superficial and insignificant, to difference as essential and important, (b) from difference as a menace and defy, to difference as a chance and benefit, (c) from difference as a source of denial and exclusion, to difference as a source of recognition and reward, and (d) from difference as opposite to society building, to difference as fundamental.

According to Fish (1997), difference may be encouraged as a positive contribution to society. But its recognition relies on accepting a common institutional structure that frequently squeezes differences into a one-size-fits-all sameness or, instead, dismisses them as reflective of a basically universal humanity. In the same context, Johnston (1994) argues that those in positions of power can control the diversities agenda by defining what differences count, what counts as difference. However such a contested politics draws a multicultural society into a governance contradiction: how to engage difference without marginalising it, while advancing the objectives of justice and inclusiveness

against national interests. In general, the diversity of societies is unavoidable and there is no magical recipe for improving the prospects of living together with difference, even though pressure rises to remove conservative governance models in a changing and diverse world. The politics of difference, then, tries to cope with the challenge of converting the contradictory suggestions into practice i.e., multicultural governance.

### 3.2 Multicultural Governance

As a policy, multiculturalism generally symbolises an inspiring discourse for founding idealistic principles of accommodating coexistence. However, as a governance of diversity and difference, multiculturalism supports the promotion of all together governance around the legality of difference as different yet equal. Besides, a policy structure sets up the full and equal contribution of minorities through elimination of discriminatory obstacles, whereas the making of cultural space validates a minority right to be treated the same as a matter, yet to be treated as different when circumstances dictate. For Kymlicka (2008), the legitimate status of multiculturalism as governance is generally approved as much as it pushes society to engage differences without falling into anarchy. Paradoxically, all diverse societies have to face the challenges of making inclusive governance for living together. They must also deal with an inevitable multicultural dilemma: how to construct a cohesive yet affluent society without eroding the integrity of its constituent elements.

Furthermore, multicultural governance is mainly a political instrument to achieve political objectives in a suitable way (Ahmed, 2000 cited in Fleras, 2009). Thus, an official multiculturalism is principally a dominant discourse in defence of leading ideology that represents a brilliant branding strategy for conflict resolution and impression management. Besides, the basic logic of official multiculturalism is deliberately practical, with national interests prevailing over secondary concerns (Bader, 2007 cited in Fleras, 2009). In other words, multiculturalism as governance promoted the delusion of change and inclusiveness by masking white supremacist order while muting the profoundly ingrained conflicts of race and power (Thobani, 2007 cited in Fleras, 2009). Certainly, a state multiculturalism is not only about power and control. National interests offset social equality and cultural recognition, though, the accomplishment of these commitments may combine patterns of control. Nevertheless, as Caws (1994) asserts, an official multiculturalism has engrossed conflicting social articulations and political goals that many despair of any clarity or agreement.

Moreover, multiculturalism forms a podium of censure and reform, of domination yet resistance, of conventionality yet difference, of control yet liberation, of exclusion yet participation, of belonging yet of exclusion. Likewise, Ellie Vasta (1996) defines multiculturalism as:

... a discourse of conciliation and liberation; of control and participation; of the legitimisation of the existing order and of innovation. Multiculturalism is part of a strategy of domination of the majority over minorities, but also calls attention, to the possibility of new forms of social and cultural relations. (Vasta, 1996, p48)

Because agreements about an official multiculturalism seldom succeed, disagreements keep on existing. Multiculturalism is particularly resistant to definition by agreement, partially because definitions are context specific, partially because the concept is always altering, and partially because of a gap between rhetoric and reality. For Modood (2007), varied interpretations and suggestions eradicate the possibility of gathering all models of multiculturalism into one plot. That affirmation makes it important to consider different models of official multiculturalism in advancing the objectives of multicultural governances.

On the other side, reactions to multiculturalism as governance are diverse. Many have critiqued multiculturalism as a protective concession to calm bothersome minorities. Others link multiculturalism with liberal changes in evolving the politics of recognition. Yet others perceive it as a political product of power struggles over rival plans. On the contrary, there are those who recognise the ambiguous partiality of multiculturalism as profit, depending on context, standards, or consequences. In between are the moderates who are unsure of where to stand or what to believe. Contrariwise, multiculturalism was intended to construct a progressive and tolerant society. Open-mindedness toward people's cultural identity would preserve social equality and equal opportunity to create a society comfortable with difference. As Turner (2006) acknowledges, democratic governance in capitalist societies includes a conflicting relationship: the import of migrant labour to the left, and a state commitment to security and unity to the right. In this regard multiculturalism embodies a strategy to resolve this political paradox in a politically acceptable way (Thobani, 2007).

For Bannerji (2000), the contradictions and uncertainties entailed within multicultural governance justify the criticism. Many accuse multiculturalism of being too radical or too obstinate, of encouraging too much or not enough change, of promising more than it can bring. In this respect Irshad Manji (2005) points out:

As Westerners bow before multiculturalism, we anesthetize ourselves into believing that anything goes. We see our readiness to accommodate as strength — even a form of cultural superiority...Radical Muslims, on the other hand, see our inclusive instincts as a form of corruption that makes us soft and rudderless. They believe the weak deserve to be vanquished. Paradoxically, then, the more we accommodate to placate, the more their contempt for our “weakness” grows. And the ultimate paradox may be that in order to defend our diversity, we’ll need to be less tolerant. (Fleras, 2009, p19)

Critics have condemned multiculturalism as vain. For Thobani (1995), multiculturalism is criticised as a massive fraud spread by vested interests to warrant minority vote through ideological brainwashing. In this regard Bannerji (2000) asserts that multiculturalism, as a capitalist confusion to divide and divert the working classes, ghettoises minorities into occupational structures and residential arrangements, thus covering the predominant distribution of power and wealth behind a “camouflage of efficient clichés”.

Also, multicultural guarantee of inclusion and justice is compromised by excessive emphasis on culture at the expense of more central categories of social classes, race, or gender. Multiculturalism, then, denotes a well-mannered and moderated way of covering unequal power relations and institutionalised racism (Lentin and Titley, 2008). In other words, an official multicultural discourse tends to enclose diversity within the existing system rather than being integral to a changing society so as to fortify its weakness in endorsing equality or intergroup relations. Bader (2007) argues that a thoughtless use of multiculturalism can cause a division of society along cultural lines; partly, an inappropriate multiculturalism emphasises the legality of those identities that might be a menace through exposing society to incursion by terrorists. Multiculturalism is taken to task for rejecting liberal ideals of state neutrality and equality before the law.

All in all, official Multicultural governance may sound good in theory, but application may fail because of difficulties in balancing concepts with reality. For instance, though its intent may be to enable the integration of immigrants and assure their loyalty, multiculturalism may have strengthened immigrants’ attachment to their homeland via diaspora’s connections (Kurien, 2006). In opposition, despite the fact that multiculturalism may promote diversity, the actual participation may have the ironic effect of engaging them into the dominant culture (Pearson, 2001).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In general, the first hypothesis has been confirmed; diversity includes differences that are reflected in various races, ethnicities, and cultures. Multiculturalism similarly acknowledges the different cultures that structure society. The aim of diversity and multiculturalism approaches is to identify and highlight communities' similarities while recognising and respecting their differences. The second hypothesis has been proved as well; multicultural model of governance reinforces the belief that the state belongs to all its citizens, not just a particular national group; the rights of all migrants and minorities to full and equal participation without giving up their right to ethnic identity; and acknowledgment that all citizens have the same institutional access.

As a reaction to repression multicultural governance has emerged. Nevertheless the concept of governance has been neither completely theorised nor entirely applied to the challenges of living together (Bader, 2007). Expectedly, the search continues for models of multicultural governance whose principles, structures, and values match the realities of the twenty-first century (Institute of Governance, 2007). Additionally, the challenge of multicultural governance is boosted by a misleadingly simple yet indefinable objective i.e., the making of a culturally diverse yet socially inclusive society without compromising national and vested interests in the process. However official authorities have replied differently to this challenge. Some support the division of minorities into separate closed societies as a basis for multicultural governance; others approve assimilation and integration as a guiding outline; and others endorse inclusiveness along pluralist and multicultural lines. For Malik (2008), some consider a person's cultural background as insignificant in defining who acquires what or who is who. For others, a person's culture reflects his or her identity and well-being so that it becomes vital to recognise it.

Besides, migrants and minorities used to accept their secondary status and social/geographical internment as a matter of course. Thanks to the spread of democratic ideals of equal status and rights that modern governance no longer dismiss diversity and difference as marginal; they are seen as legal and important components of society. Nevertheless the majority of progressive societies still face a governance contradiction in dealing with collaborative coexistence: how to manage the contrasting dynamics of liberal universalism with ethnic particularities within a structure that assures social and cultural recognition without breaking national unity. In that the challenge remains the same: to create multicultural governance that is protective of national interests yet supportive of the public good and safeguard of minority rights.

## Multicultural Governance and Cultural Diversity Challenge

---

Multicultural governance, then, approves the fact that the state could not explicitly identify with any particular ethnic or religious group but remain neutral when dealing with its various communities. Under multicultural governance, difference and diversity are endorsed in ways that make it less frightening but more indispensable to society building (Kymlicka, 2006). Yet, multicultural governance still faces many challenges: making policies and programmes including strategies and institutional measures to engage difference in advancing democracy and justice. In granting a programme that gives emphasis to a working collaboration rather than direct control, multicultural governance recognises the importance of going beyond government indifference (Gagnon and Iacovino, 2007).

Furthermore, to protect its national interests, multicultural governance requires a bilateral approach that nurtures constructive relations between varied communities through tolerance and engagement, and supports central authorities' involvement to eliminate bigotry and discrimination, build common values and create a sense of commitment and compromise among assorted components. As Nye (2007) points out, references with regard to differences combine with admitting the worth of relations, commitments, community, agreement, and shared values of engagement across diversity.

As a conclusion, multicultural governance is devoted to protect all human rights and liberties no matter their race, ethnicity, or religion, as well as minorities' rights to their own language, culture, religion, and identity apart from practices that infringe national laws or break universal standards. For Bogaards (2006), multicultural governance admits the fact that a collaborative coexistence is possible, but only when power is reciprocal rather than dominated, decentralised rather than central, and expressive rather than mechanical. In a world that is more and more miscellaneous, swiftly changing, and more connected than ever, a commitment to conformism causes problems. Through recognising the value and advantages of diversity and differences as resolutions, multicultural governance suggests a new way of thinking that relates unity to difference, consistency to ethnicity, and common values to cultural doctrine.

### 5. Bibliography List:

- Abbas, T. (2005). *Recent Developments to British Multiculturalism* [Paper presentation]. Establishing Evaluation Models for Administrative Reform in the 21 Century: Analytical Tools and Cases, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.
- Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London: Routledge.
- Ang, I and Saint Louis, B. (2005). The Predicament of Difference: Guest Editorial. *Ethnicities*, 5(3), 291–304.

- Bader, V. (2007). Defending Differentiated Policies of Multiculturalism. *National Identities*, 9(3), 197–215.
- Baldwin, S.C., Buchanan, A.M., and Rudisill, M.E. (2007). What Teacher Candidates Learned about Diversity, Social Justice, and Themselves from Service-Learning Experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(4), 315-327.
- Bannerji, H. (2000). *The Dark Side of the Nation*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Baubbock, R. (2005). If You Say Multiculturalism Is the Wrong Answer, Then What Was the Question You Asked? *Canadian Diversity*, 4(1), 90–94.
- Bedjaoui, F. (2015). *From Interaction to Interculturality: When the Dialectical Relationship is Between Culture and Identity* [Paper presentation]. EFL/TEFL and Intercultural Understanding, SidiBelAbbès, Algeria.
- Beissinger, M. R. (2008). A New Look at Ethnicity and Democratization. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(3), 85–97.
- Bogaards, M. (2006). Democracy and Power-Sharing in Multinational States: Thematic Introduction. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 8(2), 119–126.
- Boli, J. and Elliott, M.A. (2008). Façade Diversity: The Individualization of Cultural Differences. *International Sociology*, 23(4), 540–560.
- Brah, A. (2007). Travels in Negotiations: Difference, Identity and Politics. *Journal of Creative Communications*, 2(1-2), 245-256.
- Cantle, T. (2012). *Interculturalism: The New Era of Cohesion and Diversity*. First Edition. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caws, P. (1994). Identity: Cultural, Transcultural, and Multicultural. *D T Goldberg (Ed.) Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*, 371-387.
- Dei, G. S. (2000). Contesting the Future: Anti-Racism and Canadian Diversity. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Canadian Diversity, S Nanoo (ed.), 295– 319.
- EDG (Ethnicity and Democratic Governance). (2007, October 25–27). *Immigration, Minorities, and Multiculturalism in Democracies*, Major Public Conference: Call for Papers, Montreal, Canada.
- Fanshawe, S. and Srisikandarajah, D. (2010). *You Can't Put me in a Box: Super Diversity and the End of Identity Politics*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Fish, S. (1997). Boutique Multiculturalism, or Why Liberals Are Incapable of Thinking About Hate Speech. *Critical Inquiry*, 23(2), 378–394.
- Fleras, A. (2008). Cooling Out Troublesome Constituents: The Politics of Managing the 'Isms' in the Antipodes. *Rebranding Multiculturalism*, R Hasmath (ed.), 311-334.
- Fleras, A. (2009). *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Multicultural Governance in Comparative Perspective*. First Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Frederickson, G.M. (1999). Mosaics and Melting Pots. *Dissent Magazine*, 46(3), 36–43.
- Gagnon, A. G. and Iacovino, R. (2007). *Federalism, Citizenship, and Quebec: Debating Multinationalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hansen, R. (2007). Diversity, Integration, and the Turn from Multiculturalism in the United Kingdom. *Belonging*, K. Banting et al. (eds.), 351–386.
- Hollinger, D. A. (2008). Obama, Blackness, and Postethnic America. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(25), B7.
- <https://www.dissentmagazine.org>
- Inglis, C. (1996). Multiculturalism: New Policy Response to Diversity. *Management of Social Transformations (MOST)*, UNESCO Policy, Paper n° 4.
- Institute of Governance. (2007). Principles of Good Governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. *Policy Brief*, Paper n° 15. Ottawa. <http://www.iog.ca>

## Multicultural Governance and Cultural Diversity Challenge

---

- Iverson, D. (2011). *The Ashgate Research Companion to Multiculturalism*. UK: Ashgate.
- Johnston, P. and Maringi, G. (1994). Examining a State Relationship: 'Legitimation' and Te Kohanga Reo. *Te Pua*, 3(2), 22–34.
- Joppke, C. (2004). The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), 237–257.
- Koenig, M. (1999). Democratic Governance in Multicultural Societies. *Management of Social Transformations (MOST)*, Discussion Paper n° 30. <http://www.unesco.org>
- Koenig, M. and de Guchteneire, P. (2007). *Democracy and Human Rights in Multicultural Societies*. UNESCO: Routledge.
- Kurien, P. A. (2006). Multiculturalism and 'American' Religion: The Case of Hindu Indian Americans. *Social Forces*, 85(2), 723–741.
- Kymlicka, W. (2007). *Multicultural Odysseys*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2008). Reply. *Ethnicities*, 8(2), 277–281.
- Kymlicka, W. and Banting, K. (2006). *Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. and Opalski, M. (eds.). (2001). *Can Liberal Pluralism Be Exported? Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lavie, J. P. (2005). Preface: *Unity and Diversity in Multicultural Societies*. B. Parekh (Ed.). Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies.
- Lentin, A. and Titley, G. (2008). More Benetton than Barricades? *The Politics of Diversity in Europe*, Lentin, A. and Titley, G. (ed.), 1–19.
- Lowles, N. and Painter, A. (2011). *Fear and Hope: the New Politics of Identity*. London: Searchlight Educational Trust.
- Mahajan, G. (1999). Rethinking Multiculturalism. *Multiculturalism: A Symposium on Democracy in Culturally Diverse Societies*. <http://www.india-seminar.com>
- Mahajan, G. and Surinder S. J. (2010). *Religion, Community and Development: Changing Contours of Politics and Policy in India*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Malik, K. (2008). Mistaken Identity. *The New Humanist*. <https://newhumanist.org.uk>
- Manji, I. (2005, 9 August). Not all Traditions Deserve Respect. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com>
- Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nye, M. (2007). The Challenges of Multiculturalism. *Culture and Religion*, 8(2), 109–123.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. London: Palgrave.
- Pearson, D. (2001). *The Politics of Ethnicity in Settler Societies*. London: Palgrave.
- Peleg, I. (2007). *Democratizing the Hegemonic State: Political Transformation in the Age of Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137–174.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reitz, J. (2009). Assessing Multiculturalism as a Behavioural Theory. *Multiculturalism and Social Cohesion: Potentials and Challenges of Diversity*, Reitz, J. et al. (eds.), 1–43.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Shachar, A. (2007). *Multicultural Jurisdictions: Cultural Differences and Women's Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Song, S. (2010). Multiculturalism. *Encyclopedia of Political Theory*, Mark Bevir (ed.), Sage Publication.
- Thobani, S. (1995). Multiculturalism: The Politics of Containment. *Social Problems in Canada*, Nelson, E. D. and Fleras, A. (eds.), 213–216.
- Thobani, S. (2007). *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Turner, B. S. (2006). Citizenship and the Crisis of Multiculturalism. *Citizenship Studies*, 10(5), 607–618.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (2016). *Human Development Report 2016: Human Development for Everyone*. New York. <http://hdr.undp.org>
- Vasta, E. (1996). Dialectics of Dominion: Racism and Multiculturalism. *The Teeth Are Smiling*, E. Vasta and S. Castles (eds.), 46–72.
- Watt, P. (2006). An Intercultural Approach to Integration. *Translocations*, 1(1), 151–160.
- Yates, J. (2001). Debunking Diversity's Discontents. *The Hedgehog Review*, 3(2), 106–116.
- Younge, G. (2010). *Who Are We and Should It Matter in the 21st Century?* Glasgow: Viking.